Open Ended Working Group (OEWG)

Global Strategic Framework (GSF)

PROPOSAL FOR THE PERIODIC UPDATING OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK (GSF)

I. INTRODUCTION

This document was prepared by the CFS Secretariat in consultation with the Chair of the GSF Open-Ended Working Group to help OEWG participants in the preparation of position papers concerning the guiding principles of the upcoming periodic updating of the GSF.

This document contains proposals for updating the GSF and questions designed to solicit OEWG participants' views. OEWG participants are asked to provide their position papers responding to the questions in this document, or providing additional views, by 16 March 2016. A revised version of the proposal, incorporating the inputs provided in the position papers, will be circulated as a background document to be discussed and approved at the OEWG meeting scheduled on 28 April 2016.

II. PERIODIC UPDATING

At its 40th Session in 2013, the Committee proposed that a first periodic updating of the GSF be carried out. A periodic review, according to the agreed document on the process of updating the GSF (CFS 2013/40/5 Rev.1), aims to incorporate new developments in the area of food security and nutrition, especially frameworks and recommendations from other fora. The process of periodic updating would entail a review of the full text and the adjustments of its length with a view to adapting it to changing priorities and context, subject to available resources and in line with the agreed principle of developing a simple process and avoiding lengthy renegotiation of text[1].

As mentioned in the CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW) for 2016-2017:

"37. The periodic updating process would take the form of a targeted review in order to incorporate major new international developments in the area of food security and nutrition in the text, particularly in Chapter 3 'The foundations and overarching frameworks'. The Sustainable Development Goals as well as the outcomes of ICN 2 could represent the main pillars of such update. This process is also meant to carry out a minor technical update of Chapter 4 'Policy, programme and other recommendations' to streamline its content and reduce its length by primarily focusing on CFS recommendations.

38. The periodic updating process will also offer an opportunity to think about dissemination options for the GSF, including by making it a more user-friendly on-line resource that might offer more scope to include case studies.

[1] CFS 2013/40/5 Rev.1, paragraphs 3 and 4b and CFS 2013/40 Final Report, paragraph 58a.

39. The consultation process will be carried out within the GSF OEWG with a view to finalizing the revised version of the GSF before July 2017 and presenting it for endorsement by the Committee at its 44th Plenary Session in October 2017."

OEWG members are invited to provide their inputs and suggestions regarding the elements identified in the MYPoW 2016-2017 as well as the elements to be covered in the periodic updating.

a) Chapter 3 – The foundations and overarching frameworks

The purpose of this exercise would be to identify those initiatives, policy tools and documents that should be included as additional references in Chapter 3 of the GSF. That section already includes a number of overarching frameworks providing key principles and strategies for the achievement of food security and nutrition. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (replacing existing paragraph on MDGs) and the Second International Conference on Nutrition were already mentioned in the MYPoW 2016-2017 as possible examples. In addition, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030), and the Conference of Parties (COP 21) of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the World Humanitarian Summit taking place in May 2016 and the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines) could represent other important references to take into account.

A paragraph on the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises will be included already in the Fifth Version of the GSF to be approved at CFS 43 in 2016 in the framework of its regular annual update (as it was for RAI in GSF 2015 approved at CFS 42).

QUESTION 1: *Aside from adding references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (replacing MDGs) and the Second International Conference on Nutrition in Chapter 3 of the GSF, would you propose any additional initiative, policy tool and document*?

QUESTION 2: *What criteria or rationale should guide additional references? For example, do you agree any additional references should be based on i) globally agreed frameworks/statements, ii) explicitly address food security and nutrition issues, and iii) have been the subject of CFS debates since the GSF was endorsed?*

b) Chapter 4 – Policy, programme and other recommendations

It is not advisable to change and reopening the text of the different sections of this Chapter since in most of the cases it is the result of negotiations held within CFS framework. In light of this, the foreseen "minor technical update of Chapter 4 […] to streamline its context and reduce its length" could focus on a revision of the electronic version of the GSF to make it more search and user friendly without changing the substance of the endorsed document.

In the electronic version, under each of the already existing thematic areas of Chapter 4, a link to the current and already agreed recommendations will be made available. This would bring to a more user-friendly electronic version of the GSF without reopening the agreed text of the document. This option would make easier for interested stakeholders to present case studies and good practices that can be made accessible through links in the different thematic areas.

QUESTION 3: *Would you agree with the proposed idea to limit revision of Chapter 4 to revising the usability of the electronic version of Chapter 4 without reopening the endorsed text*?

c) Use of GSF and dissemination options

This updating process should also offer an opportunity to consider how to better promote a more efficient and effective use of the GSF as well as different dissemination options.

Part of the challenge in promoting the use of the current GSF is that since it was first endorsed in 2012, it has grown incrementally each year with the addition of the approved CFS policy recommendations. This has resulted in a lengthy document that is quite challenging to navigate to those who do not already know it. This is a serious barrier to dissemination.

Case studies are a useful way of bringing to life policy recommendations and also help disseminate good practices and lessons learned. In order to enhance the usability of the GSF, all CFS stakeholders could be encouraged to submit case studies for inclusion as "links" in the online GSF, which would help deliver on the GSF's objective of being a living document with case study examples.

The introduction of keywords would also make it possible for users to quickly find the material of interest to them. Accordingly, each element would be assigned meaningful keywords. These keywords would be displayed for the user to choose from which, in itself, would inform them of the contents of the GSF.

An online, more accessible and user-friendly GSF would bring many opportunities for outreach and dissemination. Stakeholders with specific interest could easily be made aware of the parts of the GSF that are directly relevant to their work, something not possible with the current document format. Links to the relevant parts of the GSF, and vice versa, would be created in the different sections of the CFS webpage so that GSF would be automatically be referred to whenever we mention CFS products and activities or a CFS workstream addresses a topic already included in the GSF.

QUESTION 4: *Would you agree with the proposed approach of creating an interactive online version of the GSF with direct links to the different sections of the CFS webpage? Do you think that this would contribute to a more efficient use of the GSF or other alternatives can be pursued?*

QUESTION 5: *Do you have additional ideas on how to disseminate the GSF?*

d) Minor editorial changes

Some minor editorial changes would improve the coherence and usability of the GSF without changing the substance of the document and agreed language. Here are a few suggestions:

1. In order to avoid the current confusion regarding the different annual versions of the GSF and doubts on which version is the latest, for each edition, only the year would change in the title (e.g. "GSF 2015" and not "Fourth version").

2. The "Chapters", which bear the idea of a book and are used to denote a sequential document that you start at the beginning and read to the end, would be renamed to as "Sections". This minor change would encourage users to not see GSF as a lengthy and difficult text to read, but as a more

accessible document which they can navigate as they wish and go directly to the part that is of interest to them.

3. References to Millennium Development Goals should be examined and, when applicable, replaced by or aligned to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

4. The sub-sections that are present in Chapters 4 and 5 of the GSF and make reference to "Ongoing CFS work on policy convergence related to this issue" add length to the text and do not represent the actual "ongoing work", since they get out-dated as the workstreams are developed throughout the year. In order to keep it up to date so stakeholders can use it and count on it as a dynamic and trustworthy reference document, these sub-sections could be replaced by links in the online version of the GSF to the CFS products or the activity pages of the workstreams that are addressing those issues. This would contribute to the development of a more dynamic electronic version and also show the connections between the GSF and different CFS products and activities.

QUESTION 6: *Do you have any comment regarding the proposed minor editorial changes? Would you recommend any additional one?*

III. BUDGET ESTIMATE

A revised version of the budget, compared to the one presented in the MYPoW, and in line with the proposed plan, will be presented once views of OEWG participants are known.